REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering the present application. Please reconsider the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 3-5 are currently pending in the present application. Claims 3 is an independent claim. Claims 4-5 depend from claim 3.

Amendments to the Claims

Claim 3 has been amended by way of this reply. Specifically, the claim has been amended to correct spacing issues. The amendments were not made in view of prior art, and no new matter has been added.

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the title for not being sufficiently descriptive. The title has been amended to be descriptive. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Claims

The Examiner objected to the claims for improper spacing in claim 3. Claim 3 has been amended to correct the spacing issues. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 3-5 of the present application were rejected under U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,996,531 ("Korall"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 requires, in part, "input control means for selecting one of the text data input means and the voice data input means in accordance with the characteristics of the item to be inputted which is stored in the input item storage means."

The data input device of the claimed invention has an input control means which selects either a test data input means or voice data input means in accordance with *characteristics of the item to be inputted*, which is stored in the input item storage means. In other words, the claimed invention requires that the input controls means be able to determine whether the inputted item is coming from a test data input means or a voice data input means based on characteristics of the inputted item itself.

Korall teaches an automated directory assistance service for remote contact devices, which operate automatically whether the remote contact devices are designed for text based communication or speech-based communication. The Examiner asserts that S20, S22, and S24 teaches the above limitations. Regarding S20, S22, and S24, Korall teaches that text data inputted by the user "is used to query the database in stage S20. If the database does not give a sufficient output in determination stage S22, then the procedure continues to S18 and asks the user a further question, preferably judiciously chosen to enable the system to discriminate between multiple search results. Once a sufficient answer is available the system outputs an answer to the user in output stage S24." (*See* lines 33-54 in column 10 of Korall) Thus, S20, S22, and S24 are not

related to selecting one of the text data input means and the voice data input means. Instead, S20, S22, and S24 analyze the inputted data, which is either inputted text or speech converted to text in a conversion stage S14.

The determination of whether the incoming data is text or speech happens in a decision stage S12. Regarding the determination of whether the incoming data is text or speech, Korall teaches that "the interface preferably comprises an automatic question unit 18 for asking questions of the user with the aim of obtaining the data in a structured manner. The interface is able to determine whether the user is communicating via voice or text, preferably simply by analyzing the initial input of the user initiating the search procedure, alternatively by analyzing a handshake procedure used to set up the channel." Korall teaches that the automatic question unit 18 of Korall determines whether the inputted data is text or voice by a handshake procedure, which simply analyzes the connection rather than the inputted data, or by analyzing an initial input. Although Korall teaches that an initial input can be used for determination, Korall fails to disclose "selecting one of the text data input means and the voice data input means *in accordance with the characteristics of the item to be inputted*, which is stored in the input item storage means," as required by the claims.

Furthermore, claim 3 requires that *the data input device* comprises the text data input means, the voice data input means, the input item storage means, and the input control means. Contrary to the claimed invention, Korall teaches an interface 10 that is separate from the input devices 12, 14. Korall further teaches that it is the interface 10, not the input devices 12, 14, that comprise the automatic question unit 18. Thus, Korall fails to teach at least *a data input device*

comprising the input control means for selecting one of the text data input means and the voice data input means in accordance with the characteristics of the item to be inputted which is stored in the input item storage means, as required by the claims.

In view of the above, claim 3 is patentable over Korall, for at least the above reasons. Claims 4 and 5 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 3. Thus, claims 4 and 5 are patentable over Korall, at least for the same reasons as claim 3.

Claim 5 further requires, in part, "noise measurement means for measuring noise generated around the data input device, wherein when voice data input means is selected and the noise measured by the noise measurement means is higher than a predetermined value, the input control means changes input means from the voice data input means to the text data input means."

The Examiner asserts that the data input device inherently comprises the above limitations, citing lines 18-24 in column 9 of Korall. Applicant respectfully asserts that the above limitations are not inherent in Korall. The claimed invention requires that when noise is higher than a predetermined value, the input control means changes input means from the voice data input means *to the text data input means*. The passage cited by the Examiner states that "automatic transfer to a human operator is also provided when a search fails to find any matches or when the line is too noisy to allow speech recognition." Thus, contrary to the claimed invention, Korall only teaches that when noise is detected, that the user is *connected to a human operator*, and fails to teach switching to the text data input means.

In addition to its dependency from claim 3, claim 5 is patentable over Korall, for at least the above reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4-5 of the present application were rejected under U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Application Publication No. H11-288342 ("Tanaka") in view of Japanese Patent Application Publication No. H08-95734 ("Kamio"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 requires, in part, "input control means for selecting one of the text data input means and the voice data input means in accordance with the characteristics of the item to be inputted which is stored in the input item storage means."

Tanaka teaches an interface device having an image detection engine 101, voice recognition engine 102, operation input 103 composed of a mouse or keyboard, input integrating part 104 for integrating the inputs and detecting the user intent and feedback generating part 105 for performing an output to the user based on the detected intent. In Tanaka, image, sound, and operation information are integrated (*See* paragraph [0035] of Tanaka). In other words, the interface integrates the different inputs using an equation (*See*, for example, Equation 2 of Tanaka). The *selecting* by an input control means based on the characteristics of the item to be inputted never occurs in Tanaka, because the *user* selects which inputs will be used, and Tanaka integrates all of the selected inputs using the input integrating part 104. Thus, Tanaka fails to show or suggest at least the above limitations of claim 3.

Kamio discloses a multimodal input control method and multimodal interaction system wherein additional inputs (e.g., speech input in addition to keyboard input) is integrated as a single window event. (*See* paragraph [0005] and [0006] of Kamio) Thus, the new input (e.g.

speech) does not require an additional window event, which allows multimodal interaction (e.g. interaction with both keyboard and speech) without requiring a separate management system for the additional input. Because Kamio never selects an input, Kamio clearly fails to show or suggest at least *selecting* one of the text data input means and the voice data input means in accordance with the characteristics of the item to be inputted which is stored in the input item storage means, as required by the claims.

In view of the above, claim 3 is patentable over Tanaka and Kamio, whether considered separately or in combination, for at least the above reasons. Claims 4 and 5 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 3. Thus, claims 4 and 5 are patentable over Korall, at least for the same reasons as claim 3.

Claim 5 further requires, in part, "noise measurement means for measuring noise generated around the data input device, wherein when voice data input means is selected and the noise measured by the noise measurement means is higher than a predetermined value, the input control means changes input means from the voice data input means to the text data input means."

Tanaka and Kamio fail to show or suggest at least measuring noise when voice data input is selected, or changing to text data input when the noise is above a predetermined level. In fact, it would not make sense to do so, because both Tanaka and Kamio are concerned with *the integration of inputs*, not the selection of a single input.

In addition to its dependency from claim 3, claim 5 is patentable over Tanaka and Kamio, whether considered separately or in combination, for at least the above reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places the present application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account No. 50-0591, under Order No. 15115/086001 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: August 24, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Thomas K. Scherer
Registration No.: 45,079
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant